



Application No: GB 0225242.7
Claims searched: 1-6

Examiner: Gerrie Mullen
Date of search: 30 October 2003

Patents Act 1977 : Search Report under Section 17

Documents considered to be relevant:

Category	Relevant to claims	Identity of document and passage or figure of particular relevance
A	-	GB 2093986 A (Hirota et al.)
A	-	EP 953537 A3 (Mizutani et al.) see whole document, especially figures 3, 4 and page 3 paragraph 14.
A	-	EP 839750 A3 (Remmers et al.) see whole document, especially figures 1 and 2.
A	-	JP 10273272 A (Ando) see abstract and figures.

Categories:

X Document indicating lack of novelty or inventive step	A Document indicating technological background and/or state of the art.
Y Document indicating lack of inventive step if combined with one or more other documents of same category.	P Document published on or after the declared priority date but before the filing date of this invention.
& Member of the same patent family	E Patent document published on or after, but with priority date earlier than, the filing date of this application.

Field of Search:

Search of GB, EP, WO & US patent documents classified in the following areas of the UKC^Y:

B8L, G1A, G3N

Worldwide search of patent documents classified in the following areas of the IPC^Z:

B66B, G01S, G06T, G08B

The following online and other databases have been used in the preparation of this search report:

EPODOC, WPI, JAPIO



Your ref: AIRDRI/SSLD
Application No: GB 0225242.7
Applicant: Airdri Limited

Latest date for reply: 1 November 2004

Examiner: Gerrie Mullen
Tel: 01633 813528
Date of report: 31 October 2003

Page 1/1

**Patents Act 1977
Combined Search and Examination Report under Sections 17 & 18(3)**

Clarity and support (Sections 14(5)(b) and (c))

1. There appear to be two aspects to the signal provided by claims 1 and 3. Firstly, that the car can be "caused to stop" at a station (e.g. claim 1, line 3) and that a "predetermined region" (claim 1, step 4) can be scanned. The latter feature is clearly supported by figure 1. However, in order for the former feature to be supported, the camera 21 would need to interact with apparatus disposed on the lift shaft; no such apparatus is disclosed. You should make it clear if this feature is merely included as preamble.

2. It is not clear if the phrase "such as" in claim 1 is intended to limit the scope of the same.

3. In claims 1 and 3, the exact nature of the relationship between the "scanning device" and the "scanning extension means" is rendered unclear by the use of "or otherwise linked".

4. Claims 1, 3 and 4 are unclear with respect to "scanning extension means", a term which is not commonly applied in the art.

5. In claim 3, it is not clear that the "scanning extension means" is the same as the "independent scanning extension means" of claim 1.

6. It is not certain that the "scanning means" of claim 2 is the same as the "independent scanning extension means" of claim 1.

7. It is not clear that "conducted means" in claim 5 is supported by the description; lines 18 to 20 on page 4 suggest that electrical (conducting) switches are not preferred, and that signal continuity is achieved by radiated means, e.g. the alignment of the camera and the lens. Moreover, although the term "mechanical multiplexing" in claim 5 is defined on lines 18 to 20 of page 4, it is not made clear in the claim that the "mechanical multiplexing" is achieved by way of alignment of the "scanning device" and the "independent scanning extension means".